

General Comment Recap from 6/29, 7/3 Flood Caucus Meetings

The California Water Plan Flood Caucus held a workshop to review the first draft of the Update 2013 Integrated Flood Management Resource Management Strategy. The caucus members conducted a walkthrough of the 28 page document, and provided feedback to staff. Comments and discussion received were recorded by the note taker, and summarized in this document. Comprehensive meeting minutes will follow at a later date.

Meeting materials can be found on the CWP website:

<http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/materials/index.cfm?subject=jul1212>

Universal Comments (Full Flood RMS)

- Add references and citations
- Continue a discussion on the placement of *Appendix A*

Definition, Introduction (Pages 1-2)

- Intro should be concise and have a clear narrative
- The subject of the RMS should be clearly identified as Flood Management in the context of Integrated Water Management
- Land use planning process alone will not address environmental and ecosystem issues
- Define key terminology and make fewer assumptions about the reader's knowledge of flood management issues

Background (Pages 2-5)

- Introduction and Background need to highlight beneficial functions of flooding (explain twin nature of flooding) and integration with multiple benefits. The current version is too focused on "flood risk exposure"
- Discuss traditional flood management approach and how it has helped create flood risk by allowing development in floodplains
- Explain why FM/IWM is the new approach to flood management, and define what FM/IWM means

Description (Pages 6-10)

- Reduce redundancy between Description and Introduction
- Expand on connection between land use and flood management in FM/IWM definition
- Add a policy/legislative/governance background, and possibly a timeline of major flood events

- Add more detail on management action category descriptions (i.e., flood warning, O&M of natural systems, flood recovery, etc.)

Connections to other RMS's (Pages 10-16)

- Further refine some of the links between this RMS and others

Benefits of IWM (Pages 16-18)

- Restructure the organization of the *Benefits* section to better match the *Costs* section
- The Benefits section should highlight the multiple, measurable benefits of IWM (i.e., water quality, water supply, ecosystem restoration, etc.)

Potential Costs (Pages 18-19)

- Attempt to quantify costs. Potentially use a case study, IRWM database, or cost figures from the 2012 Central Valley Flood Protection Plan or Flood Future Report

RMS Recommendations from 2009 (handout)

http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/docs/meeting_materials/caucus/2012.06.29/2009_Recommendations_Status06-27-12V2.pdf

- Item 5, IRWM plans moving forward into maintenance and incorporation.
- Item 7, Needs clarification and expansion
- Item 8, Continue discussion on 200 year urban level of protection
- Item 8, what is the State's obligation for providing mapping of flood risk to locals?
- Item 12, Continue discussion – carry forward
- Item 14, Carry forward
- Item 15, Better data, better maps as a thread
- Item 16, Carry forward, with some clean up
- Item 17, Does not meet criteria – possibly deleted?
- Item 18, Carry forward, but is it measurable?
- Item 19, Carry forward
- Item 20, Carry forward, with some modification regarding discussion of funding
- Item 21, Possible deletion, maybe move concepts to other recommendations

- Item 21, Too narrow in focus on floodplains.
- Item 22, and 23 Move this forward.

Recommendations Review – 2013 Draft (Pages 24-28)

- Item 1, Possibly establish the regions in this item
- Item 1, Add 2009 recommendation 12, with language – DWR should work with stakeholders to identify
- Item 2, Caution on language, need for clear intent. Suggested direction is “improve communication, innovative solutions”
- Item 2, More than flood, expand to include HCPs/environmental permitting
- Item 2, Clarify regional flood configurations
- Item 2, Should call out O&M, not just projects
- Item 2, Add/Integrate *2009 Recommendation 18* (broader CEQA issues)
- Item 3, Possibly move under “funding”
- Item 8, Continue discussion on local governments’ General Plans
- Item 8, “Flood projects should be prioritized on risk” is a separate rec.
- Item 9, Its more than “alignment”, it is “leveraging”
- Items 9 and 10 are necessary to accomplish Item 11, staging needs to be discussed
- Item 9, Should focus on the State doing its own work, not dictating an approach to regions. Language should be less “DWR-centric”. How can we be more effective?
- Item 10, Add recommendations to explain floodplain awareness in addition to flood risk
- Item 10, Language is too diluted
- Item 11, Language is too diluted, risk maps could be called out as a resource
- Items 12 – 16, More specific actions relating to other state agencies for emergency preparedness, readiness
- Item 12, There is no “book-end” to the grant discussion. It should be reframed.
- Item 12, Reframe as “incentive” for coordination, not limited to grant funding.

- Item 12, Provide a clear definition of roles for involvement in flood fighting and flood management
- Item 15, Needs further discussion – it may not be ready for inclusion as a recommendation
- Item 16, Missing a key component on system re-op
- Item 17, Retain and move forward
- Item 18, In need of major modification if it is going to stay
- Item 19, This may be a misstated benefit.
- Items 19-21 are not land use planning – these are floodplain mgmt. Also, may not meet criteria (may be management actions by the “Kamyar Test”)
- Items 19-21, Add/Integrate the *2009 Recommendations 11,16, and 19*
- Items 8,19, and 21 have some overlap. Some questions about the order that they should appear
- Item 21, Is it deliverable? It may be an overarching principle rather than a recommendation. Modification may be needed to make this less of a “goal-statement”.
- Item 22, Needs a re-write, intention is not clear and it’s possibly redundant with the “alignment” item. Needs further discussion.
- Items 23-28, Recognize what is happening with Central Valley 2007 Flood legislation and build on that for the C.V. and other parts of the State